

REMARKS

The present amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on June 14, 2006. In the action the Examiner states that the IDS was received and is being considered, and the applicant acknowledges. The Examiner also states that the applicant is required to submit a drawing. In response the applicant calls attention to the fact that this case entered the US from the PCT under rule 371, and was filed with form IB 308, and a copy of the International application as filed was communicated to the USPTO by the International Bureau. The drawings are a part of the original application as filed. The USPTO therefore has access to the drawings, and the further requirement is that the applicant file an English language translation of the application, which was done as a part of the original US filing papers. As a courtesy, a complete set of the drawing figures for this application accompanies this response, but as the drawings are a part of the continuing application, the applicant urges that there is no "new matter" issue.

In the action the Examiner objects to the Abstract of the Disclosure for various alleged deficiencies, and to the arrangement of the specification, which is not in the form required by the USPTO. In response the applicant has amended the specification above to provide a new Abstract, and files herewith a substitute specification. The substitute specification uses the language, according to the English translation, of the as-filed specification in the US, and all amendments are made in this amendment. As there are no substantive changes to the specification other than the rearrangement to conform to US practice, there is no "marked up copy" of the specification.

In addition to the above, the Examiner objects to the title of the invention, and the applicant has caused the title to be changed by amendment above, to the title suggested by the Examiner: "METHOD FOR PROTECTING A VEHICLE BODY FROM CORROSION".

Still further, the Examiner has objected to the claim language under 35 U.S.C. 112, as being indefinite for the use of a number of different terms. In response the

applicant has redrafted the claims by amendment above to overcome the alleged 112 deficiencies.

The applicant acknowledges the Examiner's opinion that the claims are too indefinite for substantive Examination on the merits, and has followed the Examiner's instruction to point out portions of the disclosure supporting limitation in the claims, as follows:

Claims 50-53 and 59- 62: All of the limitations in these new claims are enabled by the description in the substitute specification beginning on page 8, and describing an embodiment of the invention supported by figures 1 through 4.

Claims 54 and 63: All of the limitations in these new claims are enabled by the description in the substitute specification beginning on page 10, and describing an embodiment of the invention supported by figures 5 through 7.

Claims 55 and 64: All of the limitations in these new claims are enabled by the description in the substitute specification beginning on page 11, and describing an embodiment of the invention supported by figures 8 through 8c .

Claims 56, 57, 65, and 66: All of the limitations in these new claims are enabled by the description in the substitute specification beginning on page 9, describing heat provided through other assembly procedures. .

Claims 58 and 67: Support is found at several places in the specification describing manual application of heat to expand one of the expandable elements according to embodiments of the invention. .

If there are any time extensions due beyond any extension requested and paid with this amendment, such extensions are hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with the present amendment, such fees are authorized to be deducted from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully Submitted,
Reinhard List

By Donald R. Boys
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
831-768-1755